

<p align="center"><b>Notice of Allowability</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/784,875	SRINIVASAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>  Katherine W. Mitchell	<b>Art Unit</b>  3677	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 7/5/2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 28,29,31,32,34-36 and 43-46.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some\*    c) ☐ None    of the:
  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  
**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☒ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
  - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached
    - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) ☒ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date 20050915.

**Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).**

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),<br/>Paper No./Mail Date _____</li> <li>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit<br/>of Biological Material</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),<br/>Paper No./Mail Date <u>20050915</u>.</li> <li>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment</li> <li>8. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance</li> <li>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</li> </ol> |
|--|--|

### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. Fib 3B has been approved for content. Examiner agrees there is no new matter introduced.
2. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.
3. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Lawrence Goerke on 14 Sept 2005.
4. The application has been amended as follows:

#### **IN THE CLAIMS:**

- Claim 37, line 2, --order-- has been inserted immediately before "comprises".
  - Claim 43, line 3, "order" has been deleted and --order, said order-- has been inserted in its place.
  - Claims 47-52 have been cancelled.
5. The following changes to the drawings have been approved by the examiner and agreed upon by applicant: Formal drawing to replace Fig 3B, which has been approved, will be submitted. In order to avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must make these above agreed upon drawing changes.
  6. The following is an examiner's **statement of reasons for allowance**:

Two independent claims remain in the case, one for a computer-implemented method of processing an electronically placed order and one for a system for automatically processing an electronically placed order. The system comprises the means for implementing each of the steps in the method, and details no additional structure or means, and the method comprises the steps performed by each of the means and details no additional steps, and thus are both allowable for the same reason.

The closest prior art of record is "inside the Cisco Website, hereafter called Cisco, in view of the Examiner's Affidavit and Bisbee. While Cisco teaches a computer-implemented method and means for processing an electronically-placed order, including validation steps and revalidation steps, it is silent on:

- rejecting the order if more than a predetermined period of time has passed and the product configuration is invalid due to changes in the rules, changeable over time, that control the validity of the product configuration, while accepting an order regardless of whether it is a valid configuration if a predetermined time period or less has passed
- and that the predetermined time period is based on the frequency and impact of the changes to the rules.

Thus the details of the situations when the revalidation of the product configuration is performed and when it is skipped, and that the predetermined time period is based on the frequency and impact of the changes to the rules determining product configuration validity, and a sequence of first valid configuration, which becomes an invalid configuration due to changes in rules, and second valid configuration, complying with

Art Unit: 3677

the rules, while the original approval is maintained, are required by the pending application. Examiner notes that after a predetermined period of time has passed, a product configuration validity check must be done, as product configuration validity is a required parameter to determine if an order is rejected or not after a predetermined period of time. Neither the Examiner's Affidavit nor Bisbee teaches these details. A response to a previous Rule 105 Request for details on the system described in Cisco indicated that details on the earlier Cisco system described in Cisco were unavailable, and since examiner does not consider them either inherently in, or obvious over, Cisco, the claims are thus patentable over the prior art of record.

Further, both independent claims require that at some point a valid configuration become invalid due to changes in the rules that change over time, and that a second valid configuration be received that does comply with the rules, and that the approval obtained for the first valid configuration be maintained, without re-approval, for the second valid configuration. Thus any method or system that allows for the first valid configuration to remain valid throughout the order process would not read on the claims.

7. Newly-cited US 2003/0200469 teaches revalidation of the user's authority for access and input, not product revalidation. WO 9810360 and EP 0899672 require valid selections and does not check for revalidation during the process and require a second valid configuration after the original configuration becomes invalid. U.S. 20020198967 teaches changing configurations and validation, but has a filing/priority date later than applicant's and does not teach or suggest the features discussed in the above paragraph. The other newly-cited references similarly teach various validation and

Art Unit: 3677

configuration processes and systems, but do not teach or suggest the features discussed in the above paragraph.

8. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine W. Mitchell whose telephone number is 571-272-7069. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 10 AM - 8 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, J. J. Swann can be reached on 571-272-7075. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kwm  
9/14/2005

Katherine W Mitchell  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3677

